

Appendix
Supervised Injection Facilities as Harm Reduction: A Systematic Review
Levengood et al.

Appendix Table 1. Complete Search Strategy for Each Database

Database	Dates	Strategy
PubMed	January 1, 2014 – September 23, 2019	((“SUPERVISED”[All Fields] OR “SAFER”[All Fields]) AND (“INJECTION”[All Fields] OR “INJECTING”[All Fields] OR “SHOOTING”[All Fields] OR “CONSUMPTION”[All Fields]) AND (“FACILITY”[All Fields] OR “FACILITIES”[All Fields] OR “ROOM”[All Fields] OR “GALLERY”[All Fields] OR “CENTRE”[All Fields] OR “CENTER”[All Fields] OR “SITE”[All Fields])) AND (2014:2019[pdat]) ^a
Web of Science	January 1, 2014 – September 23, 2019	TS=((“SUPERVISED” OR “SAFER”) AND (“INJECTION” OR “INJECTING” OR “SHOOTING” OR “CONSUMPTION”) AND (“FACILITY” OR “FACILITIES” OR “ROOM” OR “GALLERY” OR “CENTRE” OR “CENTER” OR “SITE”)) Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, BKCI-S, BKCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=2014-2019 ^a
Science Direct	January 1, 2014 – September 23, 2019	Year: 2014-2019 ^a Title, abstract, keywords: (“SUPERVISED” OR “SAFER”) AND (“INJECTION” OR “INJECTING” OR “CONSUMPTION”) AND (“FACILITY” OR “FACILITIES” OR “SITE”) (note: max seven Boolean operators) (note: Boolean operator limit, had to reduce terms) Article types: Research articles Refine by subject areas: Medicine and Dentistry

^aOriginal search only included 2019 studies up to search date September 23, 2019. Coarser full-year database filters may thus result in search yields with slightly larger number of studies (includes to end of 2019).

Appendix
Supervised Injection Facilities as Harm Reduction: A Systematic Review
Levengood et al.

Appendix Table 2. Overview of Quality of Included Studies

Study	Study period	Country	Study design ^a	Comparison	Quality of execution (QoE) ^{a,b}										Suitability-QoE ^c	
					Measurement					Results						
					Description	Sampling	Exposure	Outcome	Analysis	Bias	Confounding	Attrition	Other	Total		
DeBeck, 2011	December 1, 2003–June 1, 2006	Canada	Prospective cohort	Yes or no—SIF use; meeting with addiction counselor at SIF	x					x					2	Greatest–Fair
Kimber, 2008b	May 2001–October 2002	Australia	Prospective cohort	Frequent SIF attendance (>12 visits) vs not	x		x					x			3	Greatest–Fair
Marshall, 2011	January 1, 2001–December 31, 2005	Canada	Before–after with comparison	Area within 500m of SIF vs area outside 500m of SIF, before and after opening of SIF							x				1	Greatest–Good
Myer, 2017	January 1, 2002–December 29, 2004	Canada	Interrupted time series with comparison	Police district where SIF is located vs other police districts in city, before and after opening of SIF											0	Greatest–Good
Linked study Lloyd-Smith, 2010 Lloyd-Smith, 2009 Lloyd-Smith, 2008	January 1, 2004–December 31, 2005 January 1, 2004–January 31, 2008	Canada	Prospective cohort	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exclusive SIF use (100% of injections) vs not exclusive (<100% of injections)• Referrals not from SIF											0	Greatest–Good
Linked study Wood, 2007 Wood, 2006d	December 1, 2003–March 1, 2005	Canada	Prospective cohort	Weekly use of SIF (yes vs no)									x		1	Greatest–Good

Appendix
Supervised Injection Facilities as Harm Reduction: A Systematic Review
Levengood et al.

Salmon, 2010	May 1998– May 2006	Australia	Interrupted time series with comparison	Before and after, immediate vicinity of SIF vs further away				x		1	Greatest– Good
<u>Linked study</u> Salmon, 2007 Thein, 2005	October 2000– November 2005	Australia	Repeated cross- sectional	Before vs after SIF opened				x	x	2	Moderate– Fair
Bravo, 2008	2002–2005	Spain	Cross- sectional	SIF use (defined as having attended any SIF facilities during the period between the first and follow-up interviews) vs those sampled who did not use a SIF during that time	x		x		x	3	Least–Fair
Folch, 2018	2014–2015	Spain	Cross- sectional	Frequent, medium, and low frequency attendees	x	x			x	3	Least–Fair
Gaddis, 2017	November 1, 2010– December 31, 2012	Canada	Cross- sectional	Frequent users of SIF (at least weekly in past 6 months) vs non- frequent users of SIF (less than weekly)	x	x		x		3	Least–Fair
Kerr, 2005c	December 1, 2003– June 1, 2004	Canada	Cross- sectional	Active users of SIF (e.g. all, most, or some of their injections were at the safer injection facility) vs non- frequent users of SIF		x		x		2	Least–Fair
Kerr, 2006a	September 22, 2002– September 22, 2004	Canada	Before–after	1-year period before the opening of the SIF (as a control period) and the 1-year period that spanned the opening of the supervised injection		x		x	x	3	Least–Fair

Appendix
Supervised Injection Facilities as Harm Reduction: A Systematic Review
Levengood et al.

				facility on September 22, 2003						
Madah-Amiri, 2019	January 1, 2014–December 31, 2015	Norway	Cross-sectional	Overdose location (SIF vs public locations, private homes, other)	x				1	Least–Good
McKnight, 2007	June 2004–July 2005	Canada	Prospective cohort; cross-sectional analysis	Wait times affect use ≥25% of the time vs <25% of the time	x	x		x	3	Least–Fair
Milloy, 2008a	December 1, 2003–December 31, 2005	Canada	Cross-sectional	Proportion of injections at SIF (“All” or “most” [i.e., ≥75%] versus “some,” “few,” or “none” [<75%])	x	x			2	Least–Fair
Milloy, 2009	July 1, 2004–November 30, 2005	Canada	Cross-sectional	“All (100%)” or “Most (over 75%)” injections in the previous 6 months took place at the SIF vs reporting “Some (26–74%)” or “Few (under 25%)” or “None (0%)”	x	x		x	3	Least–Fair
Milloy, 2010	July 1, 2004–June 30, 2006	Canada	Cross-sectional	≥75% of injections vs <75% of injections	x			x	2	Least–Fair
Stoltz, 2007b	July 1, 2004–June 30, 2005	Canada	Cross-sectional	Consistent injectors (defined as those who said they used the SIF for some, most or all of their injections (i.e. >25% of all injections) vs inconsistent injectors (≤25% of the time)					0	Least–Good
Wood, 2004	July 2003–December 2003	Canada	Before–after	Before vs after SIF opened		x			1	Least–Good

Appendix
Supervised Injection Facilities as Harm Reduction: A Systematic Review
Levengood et al.

Wood, 2005b	March 22, 2004–October 22, 2004	Canada	Cross-sectional	Exclusive SIF use (100% of injections) vs not exclusive (<100% of injections)	x				x		x	3	Least–Fair
Wood, 2006a	October 1, 2003–October 1, 2004	Canada	Before–after	Year before SIF opened vs year after SIF opened				x	x			2	Least–Fair
Total limitations assigned per domain					10	5	2	4	4	4	6	1	5

^aDefinitions for study designs and quality of execution domains are available at

<https://www.thecommunityguide.org/sites/default/files/publications/methods-ajpm-data-collection.pdf> Part III p 67–74.

^bSpecific limitations are alluded to in full text and are available from study authors by request.

^c“Good” 0–1 limitations; “Fair” 3–5 limitations, “Limited” >5 limitations (not shown since not included in final sample).

^dThis table is ordered in the following manner: (1) suitability of study design (greatest, moderate, then least) and then (2) alphabetical by author last name, and then (3) study year (earliest to latest).

SIF, supervised injection facility.